DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 625 HE 003 781

AUTHOR	Ecker, George Paul; Baldridge, J. Victor
TITLE	Academic Politics, Morale, and Involvement: Preliminary Findings of the Stanford Project on Academic Governance.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SCRDT-Memo-100
PUB DATE	Jan 73
CONTRACT	OEC-6-10-078
NOTE	34p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; *Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Educational Research; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; Professors

ABSTRACT

This document was prepared as a preliminary report on the findings of the Stanford Project on Academic Governance, a comparative study of the politics of decisionmaking in colleges and universities in the United States. The project is using data gathered from faculty members and administrators in a sample of 249 colleges and universities, as well as information obtained from the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the College Blue Book, and each institution's catalog. The study sought to answer 3 specific questions: (1) Who makes what decisions in colleges and universities? (2) What difference do these decisions make in terms of the conditions for professional involvement in teaching and research? and (3) What are the impacts of differences in decisionmaking structures in terms of faculty involvement in, or alienation from the academic governance process? In addition to answers to these questions, charts are presented indicating admission selectivity according to type of institution; enrolled-application ratio by type of school; financial resource base; average faculty size according to type of institution; student body size; library size; faculty age profile; percent of female faculty members; percent of faculty members holding Ph.D. or its equivalent; percent of faculty having published one or more books; and the percent of faculty members having published one or more articles. (Author/HS)

NIE 50252

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Index-ing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCRDT

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY

HE003 781

ED 071625

STANFORD CENTER
FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN TEACHING

Research and Development Memorandum No. 100

ACADEMIC POLITICS, MORALE, AND INVOLVEMENT: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE STANFORD PROJECT ON ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

George Paul Ecker and J. Victor Baldridge

School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

January 1973

Published by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. OEC-6-10-078, Component 2D.)

Introductory Statement

The Center's mission is to improve teaching in American schools. Too many teachers still employ a didactic style aimed at filling passive students with facts. The teacher's environment often prevents him from changing his style, and may indeed drive him out of the profession. And the children of the poor typically suffer from the worst teaching.

The Center uses the resources of the behavioral sciences in pursuing its objectives. Drawing primarily upon psychology and sociology, but also upon other behavioral science disciplines, the Center has formulated programs of research, development, demonstration, and dissemination in three areas. Program 1, Teaching Effectiveness, is now developing a Model Teacher Training System that can be used to train both beginning and experienced teachers in effective teaching skills. Program 2, The Environment for Teaching, is developing models of school organization and ways of evaluating teachers that will encourage teachers to become more professional and more committed. Program 3, Teaching Students from Low-Income Areas, is developing materials and procedures for motivating both students and teachers in low-income schools.

The following report presents a preliminary tabulation of results gathered by one component of the Environment for Teaching Program.

Preface

This document was prepared as a preliminary report on the findings of the Stanford Project on Academic Governance, a comparative study of the politics of decision making in colleges and universities in the United States. The project is using data gathered from faculty members and administrators in a sample of 249 colleges and universities, as well as information obtained from the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the College Blue Book,[1] and each institution's catalog.

The 249 institutions included constitute a stratified random sample of all colleges and universities in the United States. The sample, representing approximately one-tenth of all higher education institutions in the United States, was drawn from the College Entrance Examination Board's file of 2,594 institutions. Initial examination of the CEEB file revealed that in view of the large number of two-year colleges in the United States, a strictly random sample of all collegiate institutions would result in an insufficient number of colleges offering upper-division work and of universities. Consequently, we chose to undersample two-year colleges by one-half and then to weight the data to represent the true proportion of these institutions. Thus, all information on two-year colleges given in the tables that follow has been statistically doubled. The table on page 1 shows the proportion of each type of institution in our sample. Usable results were received from individuals at 241 of the 249 institutions. The weighting of the two-year colleges gave us a weighted total of 300 institutions.

---

[1] Max Russell (ed.), The College Blue Book, 13th Edition, Vol. 2 (New York: CCM Information Corporation, 1970).

Of the more than 17,000 faculty members and administrators who received questionnaires, over 9,200 returned usable results--a return rate of 53.4%. Returns from individuals at each institution were weighted according to a factor based on the number of questionnaires returned, the actual number of faculty members at each institution, and the number of administrators sampled to produce a weighted return of 57,734 individuals, the actual number of faculty members plus selected administrators at all the colleges and universities in our study in 1970-1971.

We must add that these are preliminary results in relatively crude form. They are intended to serve two purposes: (a) to provide specific initial feedback to the faculties and administrations of the participating colleges and universities, and (b) to provide general information of interest to a broader professional audience. The results published were chosen for general interest rather than for specific theoretical or practical import. The project members are conducting a number of in-depth analyses, to be published through the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching and in the professional journals.

Our thanks go to all those whose cooperation made this project possible. Specific thanks for assistance in preparing this document go to Ms. Penney Jordan for her methodological and computational aid and to Ms. Kay Macedo for her secretarial efforts and patience in working with the authors.

G. P. E.
J. V. B.

Studies Related to the Stanford Project on Academic Governance

Books

*Baldridge, J. Victor, ed. Academic Governance: Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1971.

*Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Reports, Journal Articles, Book Chapters

Baldridge, J. Victor. The Analysis of Organizational Change: A Human Relations Strategy versus a Political Systems Strategy. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 75.) September 1971. (ED 062 287) Also in Educational Researcher, 1972, 1(2), 4-10, 15.

*†Baldridge, J. Victor. Environmental Pressure, Professional Autonomy, and Coping Strategies in Academic Organizations. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 78.) September 1971. (ED 062 244) Also in Baldridge, Academic Governance, pp. 507-29.

*Baldridge, J. Victor. Faculty Activism and Influence Patterns in the University, in Baldridge, Academic Governance, pp. 293-313.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Images of the Future and Organizational Change: The Case of New York University. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 58.) January 1970. (ED 037 184) Also in Bell, W., and Man, J. A., eds. The Sociology of the Future. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971, pp. 271-93; and Baldridge, Academic Governance, pp. 532-55.

*†Baldridge, J. Victor. Models of University Governance: Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 77.) September 1971. (ED 060 825) Also in Baldridge, Academic Governance, pp. 1-19.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Organizational Change Processes: A Bibliography with Commentary. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 57.) January 1970. (ED 036 908)

Baldridge, J. Victor. Social Science Paradigms and the Study of Complex Organizations. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 76.) September 1971. (ED 062 245)

Baldridge, J. Victor, with Cotrell, R., Huguenin, K., Morris, R., Newby, R., Peterson, C., Snow, R., Stevenson, C., Stevenson, P., Thompson, R. An Experiential Course for Teaching Social Science. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, R&D Memorandum 99.) December 1972.

Baldridge, J. Victor, Riley, Gary, and Ecker, George. Institutional Size and Professional Autonomy: The Death of the Small College Myth? (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, forthcoming R&D Memorandum.)

Stam, James C., and Baldridge, J. Victor. The Dynamics of Conflict on Campus: A Study of the Stanford April Third Movement. (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Technical Report 19.) (ED 060 826) Also in Baldridge, Academic Governance, pp. 556-79.

Doctoral Dissertations

[Δ]Curtis, David V. Types of Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.

[Δ]Riley, Gary L. Patterns of Decision, Control, and Evaluation in Academic Organizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.

---

[*]Books are not available from SCRDT. Please order from the publisher. See also following note on publications available through ERIC.

[†]SCRDT supply exhausted. Publications for which ED numbers are given may be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

[Δ]Doctoral dissertations not available from SCRDT. University Microfilms number not yet available.

ACADEMIC POLITICS, MORALE, AND INVOLVEMENT: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE STANFORD PROJECT ON ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

The following table shows the number and proportion of each type of institution on which our analyses are based.

Type of Institution

	Sample Population		CEEB Population	
	N	%	N	%
Two-year Institutions	118†	39.3%	1053	40.6%
Four-year and First Professional Degree Institutions	94	31.3%	802	30.9%
Masters Level and Second Professional Degree Institutions	56	18.7%	472	18.2%
Doctorate and Post Doctorate Institutions	32	10.7%	267	10.2%
TOTALS =	300	100%	2594	100%

†This number was obtained by weighting the actual N by 2.

In order to provide individual institutions with useful bases for comparison, we have prepared tables showing results for all institutions in the sample and also for each type of institution according to the highest degree offered and form of control. Thus, on each item we provide results in the following format, giving the number of institutions sampled in each category.

Overall	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
300	98	15	32	20
	Private	Private	Private	Private
	20	79	24	12

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

SELECTIVITY

The College Entrance Examination Board rates institutions on the basis of selectivity as

1. open door
2. accepts most high school graduates
3. selective
4. very selective
5. most selective

Broken down by type of institution we get the following results:

SELECTIVITY ACCORDING TO TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Two-year		Four-year		Masters Degree		PhD	
Public		Public		Public		Public	
1) 73		1) 2		1)		1)	
2) 19		2) 8		2) 9		2) 5	
3) 6		3) 2		3) 8		3) 5	
4)		4) 1		4) 9		4) 4	
5)	98	5) 2	15	5) 6	32	5) 6	20
Private		Private		Private		Private	
1) 1		1) 3		1)		1)	
2) 11		2) 11		2)		2)	
3) 6		3) 40		3) 13		3)	
4)		4) 16		4) 4		4) 4	
5) 2	20	5) 9	79	5) 2	24	5) 8	12

From information obtained from each of the institutions we were able to compute an enrolled to applications ratio. This is based on the number of applications received for the number of undergraduates actually enrolled. (If College X had 4 applications for admission for every student actually enrolled its ratio would be .25.)

ENROLLED-APPLICATION RATIO BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
Public	Public	Public	Public
.81 [98]	.74 [15]	.55 [32]	.98 [20]
Private	Private	Private	Private
.75 [20]	.58 [79]	.53 [24]	.30 [12]

FINANCIAL BASE PROFILE

Where does the money come from? On the basis of responses by members of the central administration at each participating institution we constructed a Financial Base Profile consisting of eleven categories defined as follows:

1. Very high tuition - 75% or more of income based on tuition.
2. High tuition - 60 to 75% of income based on tuition, most of the rest from gifts, churches, endowments.
3. Very high state funds - over 80% of income from state funds.
4. High state funds - less than 80% from state monies with the rest coming mostly from tuition.
5. High Church - over 15% of income from Church with the rest from high tuition or gifts.
6. State and Tuition - State funds and tuition combine to account for 90% of income (45% to 55% from each source).
7. High State and Local Funds - at least 75% of income is from state and local funds. Tuition accounts for most of the rest.
8. State and Local Funds - 60 to 75% of total income is from state and local funds. Tuition accounts for most of the rest.
9. Dispersed - Funds from a wide variety of sources.
10. Over 50% federal support.
11. Local - over 80% of funds are from city or county.

FINANCIAL RESOURCE BASE

Two-year		Four-year		Masters Degree		PhD	
Public		Public		Public		Public	
1)		1)		1)		1)	
2)	2	2)		2)	1	2)	
3)	16	3)	2	3)	10	3)	2
4)	20	4)	10	4)	12	4)	5
5)	2	5)		5)		5)	
6)	2	6)	2	6)	8	6)	2
7)	38	7)		7)		7)	
8)	14	8)		8)		8)	
9)		9)	1	9)	1	9)	11
10)		10)		10)		10)	
11)	4	11)		11)		11)	
	98		15		32		20
Private		Private		Private		Private	
1)	4	1)	34	1)	10	1)	2
2)	4	2)	25	2)	6	2)	2
3)		3)		3)		3)	
4)		4)	1	4)		4)	
5)	12	5)	11	5)	1	5)	
6)		6)		6)		6)	
7)		7)		7)		7)	
8)		8)	2	8)		8)	
9)		9)	6	9)	7	9)	7
10)		10)		10)		10)	1
11)		11)		11)		11)	
	20		79		24		12

SIZE OF INSTITUTION

AVERAGE FACULTY SIZE ACCORDING TO TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
Public	Public	Public	Public
110 (98)	126 (15)	250 (32)	910 (20)
Private	Private	Private	Private
39 (20)	82 (79)	117 (24)	754 (12)

STUDENT SIZE

Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
Public	Public	Public	Public
2216 [98]	2812 [15]	3707 [32]	15198 [20]
Private	Private	Private	Private
600 [20]	1012 [79]	1546 [24]	8127 [12]

LIBRARY SIZE - ACCOUNTING FOR THOUSANDS OF VOLUMES IN THE LIBRARY SYSTEM

Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
Public	Public	Public	Public
40.7 [98]	55.3 [15]	103.4 [32]	707.2 [20]
Private	Private	Private	Private
21.8 [20]	71.5 [79]	140.0 [24]	1115.1 [12]

FACULTY PROFILE

Information provided by faculty members from the 300 colleges and universities responding provided us with the following information about themselves. The percents listed provide a profile for 57,000 academics.

FACULTY AGE PROFILE

	Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
		Public	Public	Public	Public
Under 30	13.4	14.9	13.3	9.5	8.7
30-40	36.6	37.9	42.9	37.8	35.9
41-50	27.4	27.9	25.3	30.6	30.2
51-60	16.2	14.6	15.2	16.4	18.9
60+	6.6	4.8 [98]	3.7 [15]	6.0 [32]	6.8 [20]
	Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
Under 30		14.7	14.4	14.4	9.2
30-40		30.5	35.5	34.8	38.0
41-50		25.4	25.3	27.4	28.9
51-60		22.5	15.8	17.5	15.8
60+		7.3 [20]	9.2 [79]	6.0 [24]	8.1 [12]

LENGTH OF TIME SPENT AT THE EMPLOYING INSTITUTION

	Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
		Public	Public	Public	Public
1-3 yrs.	38.1	44.7	41.2	32.7	26.1
4-8	36.4	39.2	37.4	39.8	37.5
9-15	15.1	11.1	12.7	16.4	19.3
15+	10.6	5.0	8.9	11.5	17.2
		98	15	32	20
	Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
1-3 yrs.		34.8	38.3	34.2	26.1
4-8		35.2	33.4	30.5	32.6
9-15		18.4	16.7	17.4	19.0
15+		11.7	11.4	17.8	22.6
		20	79	24	12

PERCENT FEMALE FACULTY MEMBERS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
25.4	24.9	20.9	21.2	14.6
	98	15	32	20
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	51.7	28.6	19.0	13.3
	20	79	24	12

PERCENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS HOLDING PhD OR ITS EQUIVALENT

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
38.6	15.8	46.9	52.8	74.5
	98	15	32	20
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	12.1	45.7	56.5	78.5
	20	79	24	12

PERCENT OF FACULTY HAVING PUBLISHED ONE OR MORE BOOKS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
15.9	9.5 [98]	16.9 [15]	19.7 [32]	29.3 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	6.4 [20]	15.3 [79]	23.8 [24]	39.3 [12]

PERCENT OF FACULTY HAVING PUBLISHED ONE OR MORE ARTICLES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
12.1	5.4 [98]	12.5 [15]	12.0 [32]	33.8 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	6.2 [20]	11.0 [79]	16.0 [24]	38.3 [12]

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

The concern of our study is with academic governance. Who makes what decisions in colleges and universities? What difference do these decisions make in terms of the conditions for professional involvement in teaching and research? What are the impacts of differences in decision making structures in terms of faculty involvement in, or alienation from the academic governance process?

WHO MAKES WHAT DECISIONS?

Decisions at the Departmental Level.

Faculty members responded to the following item.

> Several special situations exist about departmental structures: (1) Some smaller schools have "divisions" but no department as such. If yours is structured this way answer as if it were a department. (2) You may belong to a small research sub-unit which is not actually called a department. If so, answer as if it were a department.
>
> In your department, which one of the following statements most nearly characterizes the decision-making processes over general academic policies? (Check one)
>
> Dominated by a strong chairman or head . . . . . ___1
> Dominated by small cliques of professors . . . . . ___2
> Strong leadership, but nevertheless clear input from a wide spectrum of faculty through committees, etc. . . . . ___3
> More or less democratically run by faculty working together . . . . . ___4

We characterized a 1 or a 2 response as an indicator of a high degree of centralization at the departmental level. The averages for high degree of centralization are as follows.

HIGH CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING AT THE DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
19.3	17.5 [98]	26.1 [15]	25.7 [32]	24.7 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	8.6 [20]	19.4 [79]	16.3 [24]	21.7 [12]

Faculty members responded to a similar item at the college and institutional levels.

> Many larger colleges or universities have intermediate organizational units called "colleges" or "schools." Examples include the law school, the college of education, the school of engineering, the school of humanities and sciences. For our purpose there is no difference between the terms "schools" and "college" except for one warning: the terms "college" as used here does not refer to the total institution, but only a sub-unit within a complex institution.
>
> In your "school" or "college" sub-unit which one of the following statements most nearly characterizes the decision-making processes over academic policies? (Check one)
>
> Dominated by a strong dean . . . . . ___1
> Dominated by strong dean and small cliques of faculty members . . . . . ___2
> Strong leadership from dean, but important influence by a broad spectrum of faculty members and faculty committees . . . . . ___3
> More or less democratically run by the faculty through its meetings and committees cooperation with the dean . . . . . ___4

Again, a 1 or 2 response was taken as an indicator of a high degree of centralization at the college level. The average responses for these items are below.

HIGH CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING AT THE COLLEGE AND SCHOOL LEVEL

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
30.2	28.1 [98]	32.9 [15]	34.8 [32]	35.4 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	52.4 [20]	27.4 [79]	15.1 [24]	34.7 [12]

DECISION PROCESSES AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

In this section are some questions about the entire college or university at its highest levels.

> At the institutional level, which one of the following statements most nearly characterizes the decision-making processes on major academic policy questions: (Check one)
>
> Dominated by the central administration and the trustees . . . . . ___1
> Dominated by central administration, trustees, and small cliques of professors . . . . . ___2
> Strong leadership from officials, but much influence by a broad spectrum of faculty through committees, faculty senates, etc. . . . . ___3
> More or less democratically run by faculty, administration, and trustees working together . . . . . ___4

Faculty Members

Again, a 1 or 2 response was taken as an index of a high degree of institutional centralization.

HIGH CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
43.5	47.8 [98]	42.4 [15]	46.3 [32]	50.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	48.9 [20]	39.0 [79]	27.2 [24]	45.3 [12]

One section of our questionnaire dealt with influence over recurring issues within colleges and universities. Faculty members rated different groups on a scale of one (low) to 5 (high) in terms of influence.

ISSUE 1 THE SELECTION OF A NEW DEPARTMENT HEAD

INFLUENCE OF THE PRESIDENT AND HIS STAFF

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
3.9	3.9 [98]	3.7 [15]	3.9 [32]	3.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	4.5 [20]	4.0 [79]	3.8 [24]	2.8 [12]

INFLUENCE OF DEANS OF SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
3.8	3.4 [98]	3.9 [15]	3.9 [32]	4.2 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	3.9 [20]	4.0 [79]	3.7 [24]	3.7 [12]

INFLUENCE OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY OR DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
3.1	3.1 [98]	3.1 [15]	3.4 [32]	3.7 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	2.3 [20]	2.8 [79]	3.9 [24]	3.4 [12]

ISSUE 2 LONG-RANGE INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRESIDENT AND HIS STAFF

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
4.7	4.6 [98]	4.6 [15]	4.7 [32]	4.6 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	4.9 [20]	4.7 [79]	4.6 [24]	4.6 [12]

THE INFLUENCE OF DEANS OF SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
3.8	3.7 [98]	4.3 [15]	3.8 [32]	3.6 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	3.7 [20]	3.9 [79]	3.7 [24]	3.8 [12]

THE INFLUENCE OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY OR FACULTY COMMITTEES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
2.5	2.5 [98]	2.8 [15]	2.5 [32]	2.3 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	2.5 [20]	2.6 [79]	2.7 [24]	2.3 [12]

ISSUE 3 FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRESIDENT AND HIS STAFF

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
4.0	4.2 (98)	3.8 (15)	3.8 (32)	2.9 (20)
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	4.2 (20)	4.1 (79)	4.0 (24)	2.6 (12)

THE INFLUENCE OF THE DEAN OF SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
4.1	4.0 (98)	4.2 (15)	3.9 (32)	4.0 (20)
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	4.2 (20)	4.3 (79)	3.9 (24)	3.7 (12)

THE INFLUENCE OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY OR DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
2.8	2.6 (98)	3.1 (15)	3.2 (32)	3.7 (20)
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	1.8 (20)	2.6 (79)	3.4 (24)	4.1 (12)

ISSUE 4 GLOBAL ISSUES

Faculty members responded to the following item, rating groups on general influence from low (1) to high (5).

> Regarding most of the decision-making in your particular institutions, which groups seem to repeatedly exert influence over issues?
>
> On this issue we constructed a ratio of external versus internal influence based on these faculty perceptions. Our formula combined as external forces the ratings of Trustees and community groups, public advisory boards, and special interest groups; as internal forces we combined the ratings of institution wide faculty committees, including the faculty senate and its committees, departmental faculty or departmental committees, and department heads. The average scores on these items are below.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL INFLUENCE RATIO-FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
0.6	0.7 [98]	0.6 [15]	0.6 [32]	0.7 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	0.6 [20]	0.6 [79]	0.5 [24]	0.5 [12]

Where do faculty members feel their inputs are efficacious?

Faculty members responded to the following item.

> Faculty committees tend to be concerned with trivial matters, while the important decisions are made by the administration. (Circle one) Agree Disagree

The average of institutional scores of agreement with this item are below.

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT THAT FACULTY COMMITTEES ARE TRIVIAL

Natl' Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
45.4	47.4 [98]	42.8 [15]	48.7 [32]	52.0 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	51.3 [20]	45.1 [79]	29.4 [24]	37.5 [12]

THE FACULTY SITUATION

How much say does the faculty have in regulating its own affairs? We have selected two items that measure the extent to which a faculty member's activities are regulated by his peers, and the extent to which bureaucratic rules govern faculty activity.

PEER EVALUATION

Faculty members responded to the following series of questions.

> Who actually evaluates your performance for salary, promotion, tenure, and other rewards?

EVALUATORS: KEY

1 = students
2 = department colleagues
3 = appointment & promotion committees or other faculty committees
4 = department head
5 = members of your discipline in other institutions
6 = dean of the school and his staff
7 = President and his staff
8 = Board of Trustees

A. Who evaluates your Undergraduate Teaching?

I don't teach undergraduates (PLEASE CHECK BOX, AND GO ON TO QUESTION B) ☐

Write in KEY number of most influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of second influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of third influential evaluator ___

B. Who evaluates your Graduate Teaching?

I don't teach graduate students (PLEASE CHECK BOX, AND GO ON TO QUESTION C) ☐

Write in KEY number of most influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of second influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of third influential evaluator ___

C. Who evaluates your Research and Scholarship?

I don't conduct research (PLEASE CHECK BOX, AND GO ON TO QUESTION D) ☐

Write in KEY number of most influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of second influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of third influential evaluator ___

D. Who evaluates your Committee Work and other Institutional Service?

I do not engage in Committee Work or Institutional Service (PLEASE CHECK BOX, AND GO ON TO QUESTION E) ☐

Write in KEY number of most influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of second influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of third influential evaluator ___

E. Who evaluates your outside Community Service?

I do not engage in community service (PLEASE CHECK BOX) ☐

Write in KEY number of most influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of second influential evaluator ___
Write in KEY number of third influential evaluator ___

Responses that indicated evaluation by department colleagues (2), faculty committees (3), or members of the same discipline in other institutions (5) were categoried by us as constituting evaluation by peers. Thus each institution was characterized according to the percent of peer evaluation so defined over the total number of possible evaluations within it.

PEER EVALUATION

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
29.2	22.9 [98]	30.2 [15]	36.5 [32]	40.5 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	8.4 [20]	25.4 [79]	48.9 [24]	61.7 [12]

STANDARDIZATION

Is there a proliferation of bureaucratic red tape in colleges and universities? One index of this phenomenon is the state of specificity of institutional travel regulations.

If I wished to attend a 3-day professional conference at no direct expense to the institution, I would: (Check one)

1. Obtain prior written approval from the department head, or higher administration . . . . . ___
2. Obtain prior verbal approval from the department head, or higher administration . . . . . ___
3. Would only mention to the department head that I was going . . . . . ___
4. Would have no formal obligations to mention the trip to anyone (except my students whose classes would not meet) . . . . . ___

A 1 or 2 response indicated a high degree of standardization of travel regulations. The averages of institutional scores on standardization of travel regulations are below.

SPECIFICITY OF TRAVEL REGULATIONS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
77.0	91.8 [98]	78.3 [15]	84.1 [32]	64.5 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	82.4 [20]	70.9 [79]	54.1 [24]	33.6 [12]

FACULTY ATTITUDES

Our questionnaire included a number of attitudinal items. The following tables list institutional averages of agreement with the item.

In general the top administration of this institution is competent, able, and energetic. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
69.8	68.4 [98]	70.3 [15]	65.7 [32]	67.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	63.6 [20]	71.9 [79]	83.1 [24]	66.9 [12]

If faced with a major campus disturbance the administration would be likely to give in to outside pressure even if the actions were unpopular with the faculty. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
28.5	33.8 [98]	31.1 [15]	30.6 [32]	35.9 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	21.3 [20]	24.8 [79]	15.5 [24]	26.8 [12]

In general the administration has a very progressive attitude about faculty welfare in terms of salary and working conditions. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
60.1	57.4 [98]	63.5 [15]	54.1 [32]	57.2 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	51.8 [20]	63.5 [79]	72.8 [24]	64.4 [12]

Generally the administration understands the needs of academic professionals and works hard to make this a place where academics can work productively. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
62.3	59.6 [98]	60.1 [15]	57.6 [32]	61.9 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	51.2 [20]	65.2 [79]	77.5 [24]	68.6 [12]

Communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution is usually open, easy, and effective. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
57.3	53.8 [98]	59.6 [15]	55.4 [32]	49.0 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	51.0 [20]	60.2 [79]	76.8 [24]	54.1 [12]

Are academics more satisfied in one sort of institution than another?

Tables indicate Institutional Percents of Agreement.

My office facility is adequate as a comfortable efficient work place. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
74.8	67.4 [98]	75.3 [15]	71.6 [32]	80.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	83.7 [20]	78.2 [79]	80.9 [24]	83.6 [12]

The typical student at this school is academically competent. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
66.4	53.9 [98]	60.7 [15]	68.4 [32]	76.5 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	60.6 [20]	71.8 [79]	85.0 [24]	90.0 [12]

My present annual salary is reasonably good in light of my qualifications and experience. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
65.1	72.3 [98]	65.5 [15]	58.6 [32]	67.0 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	46.5 [20]	62.2 [79]	66.1 [24]	69.4 [12]

My teaching load is too heavy, it is unreasonable in light of my other responsibilities. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
26.0	27.4 [98]	28.7 [15]	29.8 [32]	23.3 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	26.5 [20]	24.8 [79]	24.3 [24]	15.6 [12]

Tendency to stay or leave? We see this as a global measure of satisfaction. If academics are unhappy in a given situation they'll vote with their feet and leave. The percents below are for those replying as 1 s (strong identification).

Your identification with the institution as related to employment possibilities elsewhere: (Check one)

a) My identification with this institution is very strong. I probably would not leave except under very unusual circumstances . . . . . ___1

b) My identification with this institution is moderate. I probably would leave for a better job . . . . . ___2

c) My identification with this institution is fairly weak. I probably would leave for a better job and perhaps even for a comparable job . . . . . ___3

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
55.0	57.6 [98]	46.9 [15]	47.3 [32]	51.3 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	60.8 [20]	55.4 [79]	60.6 [24]	47.5 [12]

MILITANCY

Are faculty members content with the status quo in terms of their relationship with the administration? Tables show average institutional percents agreeing.

The most effective way for faculty to have meaningful influence over decisions on this campus is to organize as a group and negotiate collectively. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
36.3	49.9 [98]	26.5 [15]	38.5 [32]	29.6 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	33.5 [20]	29.4 [79]	18.7 [24]	28.2 [12]

The strike option is one the faculty should seriously consider in dealing with the administration. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
12.1	14.9 [98]	11.3 [15]	18.4 [32]	13.5 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	5.5 [20]	9.0 [79]	6.4 [24]	12.8 [12]

Faculty on this campus ought to be more militant in their notion of what is "proper" in dealing with the administration. Agree Disagree

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
21.0	21.1 [98]	22.1 [15]	24.2 [32]	24.5 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	23.3 [20]	19.3 [79]	14.3 [24]	22.4 [12]

FACULTY INFLUENCE

How do faculty members make their views known and try to articulate their interests about questions of academic governance? Percents in Tables indicate influence activities in the last two years (69-71).

In the following list check all the activities you have done in the last two years to influence internal institutional policies at your school. (Check one for each activity)

Participated in a strike . . . . . Yes No

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
1.5	0.6 [98]	0.9 [15]	2.4 [32]	3.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	2.6 [20]	0.8 [79]	2.0 [24]	6.1 [12]

Appealed to alumni . . . . . Yes No

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
7.0	4.4 [98]	6.5 [15]	7.4 [32]	8.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	5.5 [20]	9.6 [79]	9.0 [24]	7.8 [12]

Signed petitions . . . . . Yes No

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
38.1	34.6 [98]	30.5 [15]	53.0 [32]	54.1 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	22.4 [20]	34.8 [79]	39.1 [24]	56.1 [12]

Wrote letters to appropriate administrators . . . . Yes No

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
33.9	29.4 [98]	38.5 [15]	37.3 [32]	36.4 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	24.7 [20]	37.4 [79]	36.0 [24]	40.6 [12]

Made position known to mass media outside campus Yes No

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
7.6	10.0 [98]	5.9 [15]	9.2 [32]	10.2 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	4.4 [20]	4.8 [79]	6.0 [24]	8.0 [12]

Made public statements urging particular action Yes No

AGREEMENT PERCENTS

Nat'l Avg.	Two-year	Four-year	Masters Degree	PhD
	Public	Public	Public	Public
17.7	15.9 [98]	17.4 [15]	19.0 [32]	15.6 [20]
Your School	Private	Private	Private	Private
	15.5 [20]	19.7 [79]	20.0 [24]	18.7 [12]